

DISCUSSION OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-5 and 11-12 are canceled claims. Claims 16-25 are presently withdrawn from active prosecution. Claims 26-34 are new claims. Claim 1 is amended for clarity. Support for new independent Claim 27 is found in the paragraph [0024] of the PG publication and the previously presented independent claim. Support for new Claims 31 and 32 is found in paragraph [0024] of the PG publication corresponding with the present application, i.e., U.S. 2008/0020190. Support for new Claims 28-30 is found in the previously presented claims. Support for new Claims 33 and 34 is found in the examples and in the previously presented claims.

No new matter is added by this amendment.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants submit that the references of record, i.e., Penth (U.S. 6,309,545) and Armbrust (U.S. 6,828,381), fail to disclose or suggest the particular inorganic-organic structure recited in Claim 1. The basis for maintaining the rejection of the November 24, 2010 Office Action as set forth in the February 15, 2011 Advisory Action is thus not supportable.

First, as already explained in Applicants' January 25, 2011 arguments, the Penth and Armbrust compositions are substantially different. While Penth describes inorganic compositions, Armbrust describes compositions that include a copolymer such as an acrylate copolymer (see the Abstract of the Armbrust patent). The polymer-containing compositions of Armbrust are substantially different from the inorganic compositions of Penth.

Applicants submit that those of skill in the art would have no basis for modifying the inorganic compositions of Penth in the manner of Armbrust at least for the reason that the Penth compositions are free from the organic components described in the Armbrust patent.

This is especially relevant with respect to the alleged ceramic layer of Penth which is described as a "green ceramic layer". The Office relies on this disclosure as evidence that it would be obvious to include an organic bonding agent in the Armbrust ceramic material. The Office's assertion, however, ignores the fact that Penth discloses that the organic bonding agent must be removed to form a ceramic layer (see column 1, lines 60-63 of Penth). Penth would not lead those of skill in the art to the presently claimed invention which is a wallcovering that *includes* an organic bonding agent-containing ceramic layer.

Further, the Office asserts that column 15, lines 55-67 of Armbrust describes a mixture of AMEO and GLYEO. This is not correct. At best the cited disclosure suggests a mixture of glycidyloxypropyltrimethoxysilane (GLYMO *not* GLYEO) and 3-aminopropyltriethoxysilane (AMEO).

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of all now-pending claims.


Applicants draw the Office's attention to new independent Claim 27 which recites a particular organic moiety as art of the inorganic-organic network. The subject matter of Claim 27 is further patentable over the art of record for the reason that the cited art is silent with respect to the particular inorganic-organic network of Claim 27.

REQUEST FOR REJOINDER

Claims 16-25 are presently withdrawn from active prosecution. Each of the withdrawn claims depends directly or indirectly from Claim 1. Upon finding that the subject matter of Claim 1 is patentable, the Office is requested to kindly rejoin and allow the presently withdrawn claims.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Richard L. Treanor
Registration No. 36,379

Stefan U. Koschmieder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,238

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)